

1 MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612)
United States Attorney

2 MIRANDA KANE (CABN 150630)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 CAROLYN SILANE (NYBN 4596235)
Special Assistant United States Attorney

5 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
6 San Francisco, California 94102
7 Telephone: (415) 436-6973
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
8 E-Mail: carolyn.silane@usdoj.gov

9 Attorneys for the United States of America

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
14)
15 Plaintiff,)
16 v.)
17 PABLO PEREZ-ANGUIANO,)
a/k/a Jose Escalera Aguilera)
18 Defendant.)
19 _____)

No. CR 12-0090 RS
CR 12-0156 RS

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER 18
U.S.C. § 3161**

20 On April 9, 2013, the parties in this case appeared before the Court. At that time, the
21 Court set the matter to April 30, 2013. The parties have agreed to exclude the period of time
22 between April 9, 2013 and April 30, 2013 from any time limits applicable under 18 U.S.C.
23 § 3161. The parties represented that granting the exclusion would allow the reasonable time
24 necessary for effective preparation of counsel. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties
25 also agree that the ends of justice served by granting such an exclusion of time outweigh the best
26 interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

27 //

28 //

1 At the hearing, the Court made findings consistent with this agreement. SO STIPULATED:

2
3
4 MELINDA HAAG
United States Attorney

5
6 DATED: April 22, 2013

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
_____/s/
CAROLYN SILANE
Special Assistant United States Attorney

9 DATED: April 22, 2013

_____/s/
CANDIS MITCHELL
Attorney for Defendant

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

For the reasons stated above and at the April 9, 2013 hearing, the Court finds that the exclusion from the time limits applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161 of the period from April 9, 2013 and April 30, 2013 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Denying the requested exclusion of time would deprive the parties of the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 5/8/13



THE HONORABLE RICHARD SEEBORG
United States District Judge